

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 14, 16-18, and 20-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 18 and 21 are amended with this paper. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 11, and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims contain subject matter, i.e. "removable" mass storage device, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 11, and 18 to remove the objected-to language. The objection has therefore been rendered moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keane (U.S. Pat. No. 5,195,045) in view of Rostoker (U.S. Pat. No. 6,131,125).

With regard to independent Claims 1 and 11, applicant respectfully avers that Keane and Rostoker, either alone or in combination, do not disclose a portable device for translating sensor information between the POD interface and a second communication interface.

Keane at best discloses a matching network 10 that communicates instructions

and configuration commands from a user interface 2400 to a UART 16 (col 7, lines 5-10).

Rostoker at best discloses a smart plug-and-play protocol translation cable for use between a personal computer and peripherals such as printers, video, and various network interfaces (col. 5, lines 9-13). Rostoker does not suggest that the translation cable can be used to translate sensor information.

For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 11 are in a condition for allowance. Claims 4, 7-10, 14 and 16-17 depend either directly or indirectly from Claims 1 and 11 are believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 11.

Claims 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keane (U.S. Pat. No. 5,195,045) in view of Hutchings (U.S. Pat. No. 6,269,252).

With regard to independent Claim 18, applicant respectfully avers that Keane and Hutchings, either alone or in combination, do not disclose a portable device for converting sensor information between the POD interface and a second communication interface.

Keane at best discloses a matching network 10 that communicates instructions and configuration commands from a user interface 2400 to a UART 16 (Col 7, lines 5-10).

Hutchings at best discloses a programmable bridging apparatus for bridging communications networks that use different signal formats. Hutchings does not disclose or suggest that the bridging apparatus can be used to translate sensor data

that is communicated to a POD interface of a generator assembly.

For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 is in a condition for allowance. Claim 20 depends from Claim 18 and is believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 18.

Claims 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keane (U.S. Pat. No. 5,195,045) in view of Blonigan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,359,250) and further in view of Hutchings (U.S. Pat. No. 6,269,252). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent Claim 21, applicant respectfully avers that Keane, Blonigan and Hutchings, either alone or in combination, do not disclose a portable device that connects between the POD interface and the selected types of interfaces to translate sensor data between the first protocol of the power delivery system and the selected protocol.

Keane at best discloses a matching network 10 that communicates instructions and configuration commands from a user interface 2400 to a UART 16 (Col 7, lines 5-10).

Hutchings at best discloses a programmable bridging apparatus for bridging communications networks that use different signal formats. Hutchings does not suggest that the programming bridging apparatus can be used for any other purpose.

Blonigan at best discloses a pressure sensor that communicates with a controller to regulate pressure in a plasma chamber. Blonigan does not suggest that the pressure sensor can use a different protocol than the controller.

For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that the one or more of references do not provide the requisite motivation to be combined with the other references. Claim 21 is therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 22-25 depend from Claim 21 and are believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 21.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 17, 2006

By: 

Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/EWB